HANNAH Osborne and George Stedman of Charlestown were married April 4, 1674. She married second, Thomas Barber. She was a widow in 1691 when the estate was administered.

She held 20 acres of land in Andover, inventoried at $26. Her children were:

William (2)
Hannah (2)
Sarah (2)
Mary (2)

(See Wynne.)

Referring to the statement of Bogue (History First Baptist Church of Boston) that Thomas Osborn was "son-in-law" of Thomas Gould. Son-in-law, may mean step-son. Gould had a second wife Mary. It is barely possible Bogue found something in the church records to indicate this kinship, and Gould may have been older than I think.

As I think it over, is it not possible that Thomas Osborn also had a son Ephraim, who was the one who married Jane Matson in 1697? The Ephraim, son of John, after the death of his "mother" may have gone where he was less known, and the younger Ephraim coming on have been confused with the elder one.

Of course this is all speculation, and merely suggests possibilities. The children of this Ephraim Osborn were:

Sarah, baptized Sept. 25, 1698
Abigail, born May 15, 1701
Mary, " Aug. 16, 1703
Jane, " Dec. 3, 1705
Ephraim, " Sept. - 1708
Thomas, " Feb. 24, 1711/12.

These names are suggestive.
My dear Miss Abbott:

Almost a dozen years ago we had some correspondence relating to the possible identity of one Thomas Osborn who, the Billerica, Mass., records say, was "living with Timothy Brooke" when he was "wounded", Nov. 17, 1675. Also the Abigail Osborn who on July 15, 1678, married Isaac Fox. In your searching you had sifted it down to two possibilities; that this was Thomas (1) Osborn, the Baptist agitator of Malden and Charlestown—or possibly his son, and that the Abigail Osborn was the daughter of said Thomas (1) Osborn. Or that said Thomas Osborn and Abigail Osborn were the children of the John (2) and Mary Osborn of Weymouth, and later, as indicated by Wyman, of Norwich, Conn. This last, because his wife Mary and son Ephraim came up to Charlestown, Mass., before 1678, and she (Mary) died there May 1, 1678, and the town helped pay for her coffin; and the son Ephraim—were they thought, possibly his son of same name—married Oct. 29, 1697, Jane Matson, etc. You thought it not unlikely that Mary Osborn was accompanied by other children, among them the Thomas and Abigail Osborn who later found a home with Timothy (2) Brooke, or some of his neighbors. You were also inclined to believe that there were two Thomas Osborns contemporary at Charlestown, one with wife Sarah, the other with wife Hannah—a conclusion that the confused statements of Savage and Wyman, et al., made seem very probable.

An intermittent study of this problem during the intervening years has not brought out a definite result; but it has removed some of the confusion and narrowed down to a smaller area. First: a thorough sifting of the original records—letting Savage and Wyman aside—has convinced me that there was but one Thomas Osborn in Charlestown and he with a wife Sarah. There is but one mention of a Thomas Osborn with a wife Hannah in the records, viz: "Martha Osborn daughter to Thomas Osbourne and Hannah his wife born Oct. 8, '56." (Charlestown Town Records.) Wyman, it is true, states as follows:

"Thomas Osborn and Hannah his wife admitted from church at Malden 23 (12) 1661/2. The Anabaptists both excommunicated July 30, 1662. Wyman here deliberately adds the wife's name "Hannah" to the original record, which merely says "Thomas Osborn and wife". It seems to me to be clearly proved that the town recorder trusted to an imperfect memory when he entered the wife as "Hannah" in the record of the child, Martha's birth. I suggest this: Thomas Gould did have wife "Hannah" at this date, and he had begun his opposition to infant baptism before this date, and Thomas Osborn was evidently abetting him, and the town clerk could easily be muddled between the two agitators who were disturbing the peace serenity of the Charlestown church. There is another evident error in the records as follows;

"Sarah the wife of Wm Osborne of Charlestowne being convicted of meeting with some Quakers at Benn Bowers was admonished in Court to beware of the sussed tenants and practices of those Hereticks and to return herself to the fellowship of Gods people and attendance on his ordinances." (Copied from original docket, Entry, 6 Oct., 1664.)

In the summons of June, 1664, the names appear as follows:

"Bennanuel Bowers & his wife and the wife of Thomas Osborn are summoned to appear, etc."

And in the return of the Grand Jury, 2 (2) '67, the names are:

"Thomas Goulds and his wife, Benn. Bowers and his wife, Thomas Osborns and his wife, Stephen Baker .. etc."
The land records of Malden and Charlestown indicate no William Osborn, and but one Osborn, this Thomas Osborn, the Baptist.

The accompanying records that I quote above, distinctly shows that the name "Wm." was an error of the recorder. It seems to me perfectly plain that the recorder made an error in entering the wife's name as "Hannah" in recording the birth of the child; Martha in 1656. Thomas Osborn's first child was named "Sarah", and it was "Sarah Osborn" who signed with the sisters of the Malden church, "28 (6) '51", to the General Court, in the interest of the Rev. Mermoduke Matthews. ("Thomas Osborn" signs with the men in the petition of "l3d of ye 4 month 1651").

I feel sure in saying that there was but one Thomas Osborn to be considered in Malden and Charlestown, and that his wife was SARAH--the alleged wife "Hannah" to be considered a myth resulting from a clerical error.

This town historians, in their superserviceable additions to the what they indicate to be--original records, and in their half-baked guesses make a whole lot of trouble. Bogus in his History of the First Baptist Church of Boston, calls Thomas Osborn a "son-in-law" of Thomas Gould. I have not ran this down, but it does not look at all probable, as Osborn could have been but little younger than Gould--yet it may have been possible.

Now there was one Osborn that did not enter into your reckoning when you sent me your theories; Sarah Osborn married at Woburn, April 24, 1685, Joshua Broadbent, the marshal and sheriff of New Hampshire.

The Woburn records show no other Osborn there. You will note that Wyman conjectures that this Sarah Osborn was "the widow of Thomas", meaning Thomas (1) of Charlestown. Of course this is impossible; for it is evident that Thomas Osborn's wife died between March 1, 1676 and Oct. 30, 1678, and besides said Thomas (1) Osborn was living on Nantucket in Oct. 1682, and had just married Margery (Fowler) Osgood--Rowell--Ogilman, the widow of Thomas Coleman. (See New England Reg. Vol.6, p. 25.). It of course was not Sarah (2) Osborn, eldest daughter of Thomas and Sarah of Charlestown, as she married April 28, 1670, Francis Shepard.

Now I have a theory, that the Thomas Osborn, "living with Timothy Brooks" in Billerica, "warned" Nov. 17, 1676, was Thomas (2) Osborn, the son of Thomas (1), of Charlestown, born at Charlestown June 26, 1649, whose history has not been traced, and that he probably died, and that this Sarah Osborn--called a "young woman" in the Woburn records, I am credibly informed, was his widow. I suppose "young woman" would not of necessity be construed as a maid or spinster. We have to consider that Timothy Brooks lived near the Shawshin Falls, owned the mill there, and was but a mile west of the then west boundary of Woburn. I suppose that Timothy Brooks probably operated the mill and had a man, or men in his employ. The tax-list of 1677 indicates that this Thomas Osborn of Billerica was a man of a family, as the list giving the names ends with, "and their families." Timothy Brooks was one of those families who left Billerica when the Indian scare was on, and it was possibly then when Thomas Osborn left, as he does not appear on the subsequent tax-lists.

Of course, it is easy to imagine that Thomas (1) Osborn in his obstreperous and harassed life sought asylum, for a time, with a brother Baptist in Billerica, and that when the Indian scare was at its height went back to Charlestown, sold his property--or the most of it--in 1678, and at the death of his wife "Sarah", sojourned at Woburn, and soon after went to Nantucket. He was licensed as a regular preacher by his Baptist brethren in 1668, and was evidently in the "work" at Nantucket. Possibly had been at Newbury, Mass. My suggestion that the Thomas Osborn with Timothy Brooks was Thomas (2), was an effort to account for the Sarah Osborn of Woburn 1685 and 1685, and who married Joshua Broadbent the latter year. It is reasonable to suppose that Thomas Osborn, harassed and imprisoned, was poor in the world's goods, and that his children would be apprenticed out--and doubtless among families of the Baptist faith. I feel very sure that the Abigail, who married
Isaac (2) Fox, at Billerica, July 16, 1678, was the daughter of Thomas and Sarah Osborn of Maiden and Charlestown. His last child recorded at Maiden and Charlestown (town records) was the Martha of 1666, but we know he had a later child, John, baptized at Charlestown, "19 (12) 1659/60". There was room for an Abigail, born say in 1658--or if John was a belated baptism, as is possible, then Abigail born, say, 1660, of right age for Isaac (2) Fox, born Oct. 17, 1667, (or possibly she was the "child" born to Thomas Osborn "30 (2) 1654", but she would have been three or four years older than her husband.

I have proved that Hannah Brooks, the second wife of Thomas (1) Fox, of Concord, was the daughter of Henry (1) Brooks of Concord and Woburn. In the fall of 1651 she became the third wife of Andrew (1) Lester, of New London, and was the "daughter Lester" mentioned in the will of said Henry (1) Brooks in 1662. She evidently took her children all young—with her to New London. She certainly took the two oldest, Hannah and Thomas, with her. Now I think her brother Timothy (2) Brook about 1663 also went to the vicinity of New London also, and was the Timothy Brooks who owned land in the Niantic region in 1663. Note that the record of his children ceases at Woburn with "John, Oct. 16, 1663, and begins with Mary, born at Billerica, Dec. 15, 1670. During this interval he had, at least, daughters Elizabeth and Abigail. I have not yet fully settled this sojourn of Timothy (2) Brooks at New London—that is proved it, but I am certain in my own mind that it is a fact. This would account for Isaac (2) Fox's being with him in Billerica. It is plain now how the second generation of Foxes came down to New London. When Isaac (2) Fox, about 1698 also went from Medford, Mass. to New London, his cousin Henry (3) Brooks (Isaac 2; Henry 1) went with him and also settled at New London.

Now as to John (1) Osborn, of Weymouth, Mass. and Stonington, Conn. (not Norwich). I will give you what I have gleaned. But I will say that I have a "hunch" that said John Osborn was a relative—probably a brother—of Thomas Osborn the Baptist. March 1, 1657/8, in the land division Thomas Osborn drew "on Mystic side", 18 acres of wood lot and 3 acres of commons. Oct. 30, 1678, Thomas Osborn "lately of Charlestown now of Woburn" sold "one half * * * 9 acres" of this wood lot to Thomas Marble of Charlestown. The other half of this wood lot was sold by Ephraim Osborn in 1669, but there is nothing in the records, land or probate, to indicate how Ephraim Osborn acquired his title. We can only conjecture. That it was Ephraim (2) Osborn (John 1) who married, 1697, Jane Watson, and not an Ephraim (3) seems evident, if his death record is correct "died Aug. 26, 1734 in ye 78 year of his age." so said at. 1657. Weymouth records; Ephraim Osborn, born Aug. 11, 1657. His belated marriage may be explained by his unpleasant history as given in the history of said John (1) Osborn and family, that I have gleaned, that I had better give on separate sheet. It is meagre enough, and, of course, imperfect and incomplete, and you can conjecture whether or not, when Ephraim and his mother, Mary, after the death of the father in 1678, escaped from unpleasant memory by going to Charlestown, Mass. from Stonington, Conn., they took other adult—or almost adult—sisters with them, say also a brother Thomas, Abigail and Sarah, who married Isaac (2) Fox, and Joshua Broadbent. I am inclined to doubt any such probability, and I think that Abigail Osborn of Billerica was the daughter of Thomas Osborn, the Baptist.

I do not know that this will interest you, but I will send it anyway. I hope to have a closer search made at Billerica for a clue.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
Children, as far as traced:

John born at Weymouth, Feb. 3, 1640; was living at Stonington, Conn. at death of his father in 1676, and administration of his father's estate was granted to John Osborn Jr.

Mary, date not found. Married Mar. 7, 1657/9, at Boston with John Horse of Charlestown; later settled in Windham county, Conn.

Patience, date not found. Married Feb. 28, 1662, Joseph Aldrich.

Ephraim, " at Weymouth, Aug. 11, 1657; married at Cambridge Oct. 21, 1697, Jane Hatson.

Hannah, date not found. Married at Stonington, Conn. Dec. 12, 1670, John Ashcraft. He died Sept. 1680, and she married, second, Deliverance Blackman.

Joshua date not found. He died in 1681. His will and inventory was exhibited, Sept. 22, 1681. "Hannah Ashcraft, sister," (probably unmarried).

Thomas Miner's Diary, p. 122.

April "the 6th day wednesday (1674) osbornes wedding was and the 15. day wensday I take bomb for marie osbornes appearance."

New London County Court Record.

"At a court held June 2, 1674, Marie Osburn and Ephraim her sonne being convicted of notorious Lascivious practices, the said persons are therefore adjudged by this Court to be forthwith whipped upon the naked body."

In September, 1676, the will of John Osborn was approved, and administration was granted to John Osborn Jr.

The foregoing comprehends all I have, so far, been able to find concerning John Osborn's family.

Charlestown

Mary Osborne died at Cambridge died May 1, 1678, and the town helped pay for her coffin.

As I interpret to entry made by Thomas Miner in his diary. I have a guess that John (1) Osborn's wife Mary had died, and that he had married a second wife, also named Mary, on April 8, 1674, and that it was her who with her (step) son Ephraim was involved in a scandal. It would seem that she and Ephraim went to Cambridge. If I am correct in my interpretation of Thomas Miner's memorandum—and it seems to be analogous with evident intent in other entries—it is not likely that either of John (1) Osborn's children accompanied them.

The County Court of New London County, Conn., was mostly held at Norwich, hence Wyman's mistake in thinking Ephraim Osborn was of Norwich, Conn. Was there not something in the Charlestown (or Cambridge, records, that caused Wyman to look up this court record at Norwich? Possibly some objection to their being received as inhabitants.